

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nepto.gov

PAPER

03/02/2011

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/542,221 03/06/2006 SONYJP 3,3-357 3460 Kayo Sugimoto 03/02/2011 EXAMINER LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK RODRIGUEZ, YANET 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER WESTFIELD, NJ 07090 2452 MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s) SUGIMOTO ET AL.	
10/542,221		
Examiner	Art Unit	
YANET RODRIGUEZ	2452	

	YANET RODRIGUEZ	2452			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 19 January 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal elee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.				
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A-no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE EINAL) BEFORE OF MORE 750 OF THE FORM	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.		
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i		36(a) and the appropriat	e extension fee		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (a) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of flining the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(b)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Sinc Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). 					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>					
 ∑ The proposed amendment(s) flied after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filling a brief, will not be entered because (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ∑ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 					
(c) M They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying to	ne issues for		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.			
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).		
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling th non-allowable claim(s). 					
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4 and 6-14.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a		
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER					
The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).					
13. Other:					
	(DUIVEN M DOAN)				
	/DUYEN M DOAN/	nit 9459			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly added claim limitations of: "and which is operated by the respective user while the first information processing apparatus is being operated by another user" found in the amended independent claims 1-3, 7-10, 12 and 14 change the scope of the claims and raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The newly added claim limitations of: "and which is operated by the respective user while the first information processing apparatus is being operated by another user 'lound in the amended independent claims 1-3, 7-10, 12 and 14 change the scope of the claims and raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search, and the claim limitations of the "finally rejected" claims are still met by Swenson et al., Brown et al., Markman et al. and Heaton et al.